

North American Numbering Council

Meeting Minutes

February 17-18, 1999

I. Time, Date and Place of Meeting: The North American Numbering Council held a meeting, commencing at 8:30 a.m., at the Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, D.C.

II. List of Attendees:

A. Council Members

<u>Voting Members</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1. Beth Kistner	ALTS
2. Lisa Sarno	American Mobile Satellite
3. Edmund Gould	AT&T Corp.
4. Dan Hochvert/Jo Gallagher	Bell Atlantic
5. Paul Kenefick	Cable & Wireless, Inc.
6. Ronald Binz	Competition Policy Institute
7. Robert McDowell	CompTel
8. Lori Messing	CTIA
9. Alan Hasselwander	Frontier
10. Bernard Harris	GTE
11. Peter Guggina	MCI WorldCom
12. Vincent Majkowski/Bruce Armstrong	NARUC
13. Jo Ann Sanford	NARUC
14. Beth O'Donnell	NCTA
15. Larry Krevor	Nextel Communications, Inc.
16. Dan Gonzalez	NEXTLINK
17. Ray Strassburger	NorTel Networks
18. Carl Hansen/Michelle Thompson	Omnipoint
19. Trent Boaldin	OPASTCO
20. Cathy Handley	PCIA
21. Bill Adair	SBC Communications, Inc.
22. Ron Havens	Sprint Corp
23. Stephanie Montgomery	TIA
24. Paul Hart	USTA

Special Members (non-voting):

John Manning	ATIS
Leo Mevel	Industry Canada
Ron Conners	NANPA

B. Commission Employees

Kris Monteith, Designated Federal Official
Diane Harmon, Assistant Chief, Network Services Division (NSD)
Blaise Scinto, Deputy Chief, NSD
David Furth, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau (WTB)

Jared Carlson, NSD, Common Carrier Bureau (CCB)
Les Selzer, NSD, CCB
Patrick Forster, NSD, CCB
Jeannie Grimes, NSD, CCB
Linda Simms, NSD, CCB

III. Estimated Public Attendance: Approximately 43 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

IV. Documents Introduced. Each member received the following handouts:

- (1) LNPA Working Group Status Report to NANC
- (2) LNPA Working Group 2nd Report on Wireless Wireline Integration, February, 5, 1999
- (3) Report of the Issue Management Group Regarding the Scope of Requirements of NANPA for Central Office Code Administration and NPA Relief Activities
- (4) Colorado Numbering Task Force
- (5) California PUC Decision 96-10-067, Oct. 25, 1996
- (6) INC Report to the NANC
- (7) NRO Report to NANC
- (8) Cost Recovery Working Group Report
- (9) NANPA Fund Performance Status Report & Funds Projection
- (10) NANPA Oversight Working Group Report
- (11) NANC Interim Audits Recommendation
- (12) Public Notice DA 99-347 (rel., Feb 17, 1999) Lockheed Martin CIS Divestiture
- (13) Lockheed Martin Number Utilization Forecast and Trends
- (14) Non-Disclosure Agreement, Thousands Block Pool Administrator Response to Requirements Document

V. Summary of the Meeting:

A. Welcoming Remarks. Alan Hasselwander, Chairman of the Council, provided welcoming remarks.

B. Approval of Minutes of January meeting. The minutes of the January 1999 NANC meeting were approved with one minor correction.

C. LNPA Working Group Report. Tom Sweeney, co-chair, commenced by reviewing the major work areas of the Working Group: the Wireless Number Portability Subcommittee (WNP SC) status; Wireline/Wireless Integration Status (WWIS) and the Second Integration Report; a recommendation to create a wireless number portability working group; a recommendation for a Y2K moratorium (quiet period) on NPAC hardware/software changes; the National Number Pooling Subcommittee status; the Slow Horse Subcommittee status; and, the NPAC Release 2.0 status.

Paula Jordan, co-chair, reviewed key wireless issues. With respect to intercarrier testing, Ms. Jordan reported that a documented workplan to complete the test plan is targeted for July 1999.

Ms. Jordan reported that the subcommittee had analyzed the timeframes associated with the three categories of testing -- internal, NPAC, and intercarrier. The subcommittee had identified a potential problem in meeting the March 31, 2000 timeframe for most wireless carriers, given that the NPAC/SMS Release 2.0 will not be available for production until September 1999. Ms. Jordan also reported that the WNP SC had reached agreement on the formula and assumptions for busy hour porting volumes.

Ms. Jordan reported that the Commission had granted a petition for forbearance, extending the time for implementation of wireless number portability to November 24, 2002. As a result of the extension, Ms. Jordan reported that the WNP SC had identified the testing tasks, timeframes, and timeline to achieve wireless LNP implementation by November 24, 2002.

Chairman Hasselwander raised the issue of whether the wireless industry could comply if the FCC ordered number pooling in the second quarter of 2000. Ms. Jordan responded in the negative, indicating that the industry could not be ready for a March 2000 implementation.

Vincent Majkowski, NARUC, stated that he intends to push for a resolution from NARUC urging the FCC to issue a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) on number pooling for all telecommunications carriers immediately. Mr. Majkowski indicated that he does not believe that the technical issue alleged by the wireless industry is present and that the industry's non-participation in number portability and number pooling does not benefit consumers.

Mr. Majkowski asked who has responsibility for NPAC Release 2.0. Ms. Jordan responded that the responsibility rests with Lockheed Martin. Mr. Majkowski asked whether the NANC had asked Lockheed Martin to accelerate the work on NPAC Release 2.0. Ms. Jordan and Mr. Sweeney reported that the LNPA Working Group had asked for an accelerated schedule on the work. Mr. Sweeney indicated, however, that the LLCs had negotiated with Lockheed Martin on the schedule and the price.

A discussion ensued on whether Release 2.0 included number pooling, with Anne La Lena, MCI WorldCom, and Mark Foster, Lockheed Martin, confirming that it did not include pooling at this point. Chairman Hasselwander revisited his earlier question about whether the wireless industry would be ready to implement number pooling, if mandated by the FCC. Chairman Hasselwander asked what actions would be necessary if the FCC ordered thousands block pooling for all carriers.

A discussion followed concerning whether the LNPA Working Group should attempt to develop a timeline for implementation of number pooling by, for example, March 2000. Several NANC members expressed opposition to Chairman Hasselwander's suggestion, indicating that the wireless industry had been given an extension until November 2002 to implement number portability. Chairman Hasselwander indicated that he recognized that an extension had been granted; his suggestion that the tightest possible timeline be developed stemmed from his desire that the industry not be caught off-guard. Kris Monteith, FCC, noted that the suggestion to develop a timeline did not appear unreasonable in light of the express language of the FCC forbearance order, which left room for the possibility that the 2002 date could be moved forward, if necessary to address specific number exhaust problems.

Following further discussion, the NANC determined that the LNPA Working Group should look

at the timeline for implementation of number portability and whether the timeframes could be shortened. Ms. Jordan next asked for any questions on the Second Wireline/Wireless Integration Report, which should be finalized by June 1999. Ron Havens indicated that he had edits that he would give to Ms. Jordan and also asked why some ports must be performed during busy times of the day. Ms. Jordan stated that the report simply indicates that possibility. Chairman Hasselwander raised a question concerning porting of numbers at off hours. Mr. Sweeney indicated that the question related to the slow horse issue, on which he would report shortly. Gerry Thompson, Mobility Canada, indicated concern that Alternative #2 not impact 911 systems. In response to a question from Vince Majkowski, NARUC, Ms. Jordan confirmed that the schedule for wireless/wireline integration had not been changed by the grant of the number portability forbearance petition.

Ms. Jordan then reported on the LNPA Working Group's recommendation to create a Wireless Number Portability Working Group. Ms. Jordan reported that the impetus for the new working group is to increase participation and to be able to report directly to the NANC on wireless issues, rather than through the LNPA Working Group. Following significant discussion, in which issues were raised both in support and in opposition to the proposal, Chairman Hasselwander suggested that the wireless only group officially be recognized as a subtending group of the LNPA Working Group, but that some wireless only issues be brought directly to the NANC. Chairman Hasselwander suggested that the LNPA Working Group bring to the NANC a work plan, describing the responsibility of each subgroup. Hearing no oppositions, the NANC agreed to Chairman Hasselwander's suggestion. Chairman Hasselwander also called for contributions on how to increase wireless carriers' participation within the LNPA Working Group.

Tom Sweeney, AT&T, reported on the recommendation for a Y2K moratorium on NPAC hardware/software changes. Mr. Sweeney reported that the LNPA Working Group recommended that there be no changes to the NPAC/SMS production software or hardware from November 1, 1999, until March 1, 2000, except corrections for Y2K specific problems. Vince Majkowski, NARUC, questioned the need to completely stop work for four months. Mr. Sweeney reported that the suggestion was intended to ensure a stable environment and to minimize risk. Mr. Majkowski noted that no one had come to the states requesting a similar moratorium.

Following discussion, the NANC agreed that the use of the word "moratorium" was too strong and that a four month stop on work could be too extreme. The LNPA Working Group agreed to rework the recommendation to accommodate the NANC's concerns.

Mr. Sweeney reviewed the National Number Pooling Subcommittee status, as reported on the LNPA Working Group handout. He then reported on the slow horse status. Mr. Sweeney reported that the slow horse subcommittee is in the process of analyzing "slow horse" data. He also reported that the subcommittee has started to frame ideas for industry LSMS interface performance criteria and that the next step is to develop "slow horse" identification criteria including minimum LSMS interface performance requirements, performance thresholds, and data collection/reporting processes. Mr. Sweeney reviewed the differences between "slow horse," "lame horse," and "dead horse."

Chairman Hasselwander noted that the FCC had received at least one complaint on this issue and

that he had heard that some carriers would not allow porting beyond a maximum number of telephone numbers between certain hours. Mr. Sweeney explained that an agreement had been reached at a cross-regional operations meeting to limit the number of telephone numbers ported because of LSMS issues. He indicated that the limitation was no longer in place because the LSMS range capacity problems had been resolved.

Following further discussion, the LNPA Working Group agreed to develop a draft schedule for the resolution of the "slow horse" issue.

Finally, Mr. Sweeney reported that the NPAC Release 2.0 remains on target for service provider testing in mid-June, 1999.

D. *Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report.* INC Moderator, Richard Round, GTE, presented the INC Report. The INC Report contains the status of both the INC Guidelines on Number Pooling and the INC 500/900 Number Portability effort, along with the schedule and logistics for the next two INC meetings. Mr. Round reported that INC had held its first meeting of the year on January 27, 1999, and had reviewed proposed modifications to the Thousand Block (NXX-X) Pooling Administration Guidelines and associated forms. At that time, the INC finalized the INC documents on Thousand Block (NXX-X) Pooling Administration Guidelines, NPA Allocation Plan and Assignment Guidelines, Central Office Code (NXX) Assignment Guidelines, and NPA Code Relief Planning & Notification Guidelines. Any proposed changes to these guidelines would require a new INC issue statement.

Mr. Round then reported that INC Issue 105, Number Pooling, moved to initial closure during the meeting, and that final closure is planned for the INC meeting to be held March 22-26, 1999. Mr. Round noted that all of the above-noted INC documents are available on the INC web page at <http://www.atis.org/atis/clc/inc/incdocs.htm>

Mr. Round outlined the LNPA Work Plan for the INC LNPA Workshop to be conducted on March 22, 1999. Mr. Round explained that the INC's Initial Report to the NANC on Number Pooling is an ongoing report that was first given to the NANC some time ago, is now in its third version, and continues to be modified. Mr. Round noted that a decision will need to be made as to whether to continue the report. Participants will review the INC's Initial Report to the NANC on Number Pooling to decide on a work plan associated with this document.

Chairman Hasselwander asked what kind of modifications are being made to the INC Report on Number Pooling. Mr. Round replied that different agreements reached by the INC were being included in the report, such as the agreement on Thousand Block Number Pooling. Also, as Mr. Round noted, the Work Plan proposes that the INC begin to develop Individual Telephone Number Pooling Administration Guidelines; these guidelines would be included in the INC Report on Number Pooling.

Mr. Round reported that a 500/900 Number Portability Workshop Meeting was held February 2-3, 1999. Several contributions were received, and an initial set of assumptions developed. These assumptions will be revised and updated as work on 500/900 Number Portability continues. Mr. Round then noted that the INC had agreed to a baseline text concerning 500 Architectural/Call Flow Assumptions and Use of Existing Toll Free Databases. In addition, a proposed 900

Portability Architecture had been developed and will be forwarded to the NIIF and OBF along with a list of questions for their review and input. Also, meeting participants had agreed to the assumption that all 900 numbers would be pooled at the individual telephone number level. A similar agreement, however, was not reached concerning 500 numbers.

Peter Guggina, MCI WorldCom, asked why an agreement had not been reached that 500 numbers would be pooled at the individual telephone number level. Mr. Round responded that some individuals and entities believe that pooling may not be necessary for the 500 numbering resource. Mr. Round reported that the group debated whether 500 number pooling is necessary, or whether current number assignment practices should continue where portability has been implemented.

Peter Guggina, MCI WorldCom, stated that he believed that the issue of whether individual telephone number pooling for the 500 numbering resource may be a policy issue requiring guidance for the INC. Chairman Hasselwander noted that, based on his recollection, the FCC order required the NANC to recommend how 500/900 portability would be implemented, not whether it would be implemented. Mr. Round replied that pooling is an assignment process, whereas portability is not. In addition, Mr. Round noted that the FCC order clearly required the NANC to report on portability, but did not clearly require pooling. Mr. Round reported that his report accurately reported the status of the INC's deliberations. He clarified, however, that the INC had not affirmatively decided not to require individual telephone number pooling of 500 numbers; rather, it had not yet reached a decision on that issue.

Tony Pupek, USTA, asked whether or not the 500/900 Portability Workshop could continue to work without addressing the issue of 500/900 number pooling. Mr. Round replied that he could not answer that question at this time, but suggested that some sort of number pooling would be necessary. Even though assignments may be made at the 10,000 number level, Mr. Round noted that thousand block pooling still is considered pooling. Mr. Pupek then suggested that the word "pooled" in the last bullet on page 5 of the INC Report could be changed to "assigned" to more clearly describe the process. Mr. Round agreed.

Following further discussion on this issue, Chairman Hasselwander requested that INC report on the outcome of its further deliberations at the March NANC meeting.

Mr. Round reviewed the INC 500/900 Portability Workshop Work Plan and meeting schedule for the 1999 meetings, as indicated on the INC handout. Mr. Round reported that the next meeting is scheduled for March 9-11, 1999, in Atlanta, Georgia. He also noted that the next quarterly INC meeting will be held on March 22-26, 1999, in Trinidad and Tobago.

Ron Havens, Sprint, questioned whether conference bridges would be set up for the upcoming meetings, and how well used the bridges had been in past meetings. Mr. Round affirmed that conference bridges would be set up at all meetings. He also indicated that at the first meeting this year seven persons from five different organizations participated via the bridge. Overall, 21 persons from 13 different organizations had participated in the meeting.

E. NRO Working Group Report. Co-Chair, Mike Whaley, provided the report to the Council. Mr. Whaley reported that the Working Group has held three meetings since the January NANC meeting, focussing on the telephone number reservation process and definition, and the

COCUS replacement model. With regard to the reservation process, Mr. Whaley reported that an agreement had been reached that DID numbers activated in the public switched telephone network are working numbers; and that the initial period for a reserved telephone number is defined as "up to one year," using the four criteria and conditions directed by NANC at its January 1999 meeting. An extension may be provided for as long as specific actions are taken by the customer and the service provider to initiate the extension. Mr. Whaley reported that alternatives to the extension period are undergoing further review by the NRO. He also reported that the reservation process issue is scheduled to be completed by June 1999.

Next, Mr. Whaley reported that the Working Group has received three contributions for a COCUS replacement: (1) the NANPA utilization and forecast process, known as "LINUS" (2) AT&T's "A Minimalist Code Utilization and Forecasting Model" and (3) a U S WEST model entitled "COCUS Replacement." Mr. Whaley reported that the NRO Working Group reached agreement that the implemented model must address utilization and forecasting in one tool. He also noted that the Working Group had agreed that the core purpose of the forecasting/utilization tool is to forecast exhaust of specific NPAs and by extension the NANP; to assess the current utilization within the NANP for application of number resource optimization measures; and, to check compliance with numbering guidelines and requirements. Mr. Whaley stated that the target date for completion of a recommendation on a revised COCUS model is April 1999.

With respect to miscellaneous matters, Mr. Whaley indicated that the Working Group had agreed to continue with three co-chairs. He indicated that nominations were being considered and a recommendation would be provided to the NANC at the NANC's April 1999 meeting.

Mr. Whaley provided the NANC members with a handout entitled "NRO Master Matrix." He indicated that the NRO Working Group would await further direction from the NANC and the FCC with respect to the prioritization of work. Finally, Mr. Whaley reported that the next Working Group meeting was scheduled for March 17-19, in Washington, D.C., following the NANC meeting.

F. Issue Management Group Report-- Scope of Requirements of NANPA. Ron Binz, CPI, reported on the development of the Policy Statement of the NANC Concerning the Scope of Requirements of NANPA for Central Office Code Administration and NPA Relief Activities. Mr. Binz reviewed the Report of the Issue Management Group, indicating that NANC's assignment had been to make edits agreed to by the NANC to the draft Policy Statement; to recommend whether to add the NANPA Transition Plan to documents defining the core responsibilities of NANPA in the Policy Statement; to review and summarize the relevant factual history of the California court reporter issue; and, to recommend a process to be used and questions to be considered in addressing the court reporter issue. Mr. Binz reported that the edits had been made and that the Issue Management Group recommended the incorporation of the Transition Plan to the list of documents referenced in the Policy Statement. Following Mr. Binz' presentation, the NANC adopted the Policy Statement, as revised.

Mr. Binz next identified the documents reviewed by the Issue Management Group in considering the California court reporter issue, as listed on the handout. Thereafter, he reviewed the Issue Management Group's consensus regarding relevant facts and conclusions, also identified on the handout. Finally, Mr. Binz reviewed the two recommendations of the Issue Management Group:

(1) that the NANC decide the California court report issue by applying its policy statement on the scope of the NANPA's responsibilities; and, (2) that the NANC refer to the NANPA Oversight Working Group the question of the NANPA's responsibilities for NPA planning and implementation meetings with respect to attending, chairing, facilitating, recording, publicizing, and covering the costs of such meetings. Chairman Hasselwander then opened the floor to discussion.

A representative of the California Cable Association made a statement to the NANC. He indicated that the decisions of the California Public Utilities Commission (PUC) are law and that the court reporter transcripts are used to justify NPA relief plans, not simply for the benefit of industry. He referenced an Opinion of the California PUC, in which the responsibilities of the code administrator are listed, including the responsibility to provide for a "stenographer to record and distribute transcripts of the meeting." Members of the California PUC, participating in the discussion via conference bridge, confirmed this position. They indicated that although the California PUC had never directly ordered Pacific Bell, the Code Administrator, to provide court reporters, Pacific Bell had undertaken that responsibility and the California PUC Opinion did identify it as a responsibility of the code administrator.

Ron Conners, Lockheed Martin, then presented Lockheed Martin's position, as reflected on its handout. He stated that the NANPA regards the scheduling, preparation, and co-facilitation of the local jurisdiction and public meetings as part of its relief planning responsibilities. The NANPA believes, however, that no existing rules or policies require that the NANPA reimburse court reporters. In NANPA's view, court reporter costs should be treated as they are in other states; that is, they should be paid for directly by the public utility commission or prorated to participants in the proceeding.

A discussion followed. Beth O'Donnell, NCTA, stated that, in her view, the NANPA should not be required to provide court reporter coverage in every state; nonetheless, the California requirement was an already existing responsibility that should have been known by the industry. Several NANC members raised concerns about including state-specific requirements within the scope of the NANPA's responsibilities. Conversely, other members suggested that the NANPA Requirements Document and FCC decisions required the NANPA to assume all responsibilities of the then-current code administrators and that the California court reporter requirement was a known activity.

Following further discussion, the NANC determined to defer the issue to the March NANC meeting. It also agreed not to refer to the NANPA Oversight Working Group the broad question of the NANPA's responsibilities for NPA planning and implementation meetings. The NANC's determination followed the remarks of Andrea Cooper, NANPA Oversight Working Group Co-Chair, that the question had already been before that Working Group and had, in fact, been referred to the NANC when the Working Group was unable to answer the question.

Parties interested in this issue were asked to make contributions, summarizing their position and to participate in the future discussion, to be held on March 16, at 1:30 p.m.

G. Cost Recovery Working Group Report. Co-Chair Anne La Lena, MCI WorldCom, provided the report to the Council on the following issues: a recommendation on the treatment of

variables under the fixed price thousand block number administration/pooling proposal; and, authority of the NANC to hire a consultant for a NANPA audit. Ms. La Lena also generally announced the need for increased involvement and participation in the Cost Recovery Working Group.

With regard to pricing of the thousand block administration function, Ms. La Lena reported that the Working Group recommended: a one-time true-up adjustment for variables in March of each year; that NBANC add a safety factor estimate for variables activity within the base price; that the NANPA establish the first year safety factor; that the NANPA identify fixed and variable pricing elements; and, that the NANPA provide cost information and assumptions to the greatest degree possible.

With regard to whether NANC has the authority to hire an outside consultant for a NANPA audit, Ms. La Lena reported that the Working Group concluded that the NANC has the authority to use and pay a consultant for the audit of the NANPA, if consensus is reached on the need for the audit. Ms. La Lena also noted that the Working Group recommends that NBANC is the proper vehicle to bill and collect additional, needed funds, and that NBANC should be notified as quickly as possible of the additional costs involved.

Finally, Ms. La Lena reported that the issue of individual telephone number and unassigned number portability cost allocation remains an outstanding issue for the Working Group. Those issues have been tabled pending further direction from the NANC or the FCC.

NBANC Report. Vincent Majkowski, Chair, NBANC, provided the report to the Council on the fund status, process and current activities. Mr. Majkowski reported that letters will be sent to carriers regarding the submission of their NANPA fund payment in response to initial bills rendered on or around February 20, 1999, with payments due by March 12, 1999.

Mr. Majkowski reported that the current fund balance is \$910,000 with projected receivables of \$516,000 in monthly contributions, approximately \$100,000 due from Canada, \$17,800 due from the Dominican Republic, and \$10,000 due from non-compliant carriers. Mr. Majkowski reported that payments to Lockheed Martin to date total \$3.025 million with a remaining payment of \$.275 million due. Payments of \$235,000 have been made to NECA, with \$13,000 remaining to be paid. Finally, Mr. Majkowski reported that the projected cost for an outside auditor, to perform an audit of the NANPA Fund, is \$22,000 and that the NBANC had recommended that Price Waterhouse Coopers conduct the 1999-2000 audit.

H. *Colorado Public Utilities Commission Letter of January 27, 1999.* Bruce Armstrong, Colorado Public Utilities Commission (PUC), provided the report to the Council concerning the letter of the Colorado PUC regarding the unauthorized use of central office codes by carriers lacking certification by the state public utilities commission. Vince Majkowski, a Colorado PUC Commissioner, clarified that although the letter had been signed only by one of the three Colorado Commissioners, all three Commissioners supported the letter and the recommendations made therein.

Mr. Armstrong then continued with a review of the specific Colorado audit findings, as outlined in the handout provided to the NANC members. For example, Mr. Armstrong reported that the

audit had disclosed that carriers had received CO codes for rate centers for which they are not authorized to provide service by the Colorado Commission; that carriers had obtained codes that they have not actually opened for customers; that carriers have entire NXX codes with all numbers designated as reserved; and that carriers have entire NXX codes as assigned to customers.

Mr. Armstrong then reviewed the five recommendations resulting from the Colorado number utilization audit findings: (1) that carriers requesting central office codes in new exchange areas be required to certify the veracity of the information supplied to the NANPA regarding the carriers' certification in that exchange; (2) that the NANPA be required to audit carrier requests for new CO codes and to be allowed to withhold such codes upon a finding on non-certification; (3) that the NANPA be required to perform audits across the entire NANP on carriers that have been found to misrepresent their need for central office codes in an uncertified territory; (4) that the LERG assignment of a new CO code to an exchange be required to correspond with the requested exchange made to the NANPA when the code was requested; and, (5) that any change to the exchange assigned to a particular central office code in the LERG be verified regarding that carrier's certification for the new exchange.

In response, Ron Conners, Director, NANP Administration, supported Colorado's audit activities. Mr. Conners stated, however, that industry guidelines do not require the steps work suggested by the first and second recommendations; rather the CO code administration guidelines only require carriers to certify that they are authorized in that exchange. With respect to the third recommendation, Mr. Conners indicated that the NANPA needs additional guidance before it could perform the suggested audits. Finally, Mr. Conners stated that the NANPA would be unable to perform the functions suggested by the fourth and fifth recommendations because once NANPA assigns a code, it disconnects and does not have any involvement in the verification of the LERG database.

The NANC discussed the issues raised by the Colorado letter, including changes to SS7 networks that might be necessary, the disassociation of the current rate center with rating and routing, how many of the problems raised by the letter might be solved by the NANC's ongoing work, the need for telephone number administration guidelines, and enforcement follow-up on requests for codes. Following significant discussion, Chairman Hasselwander suggested that at its meeting that evening, the Steering Group considered the issues and recommend a course of action to the NANC the following day. The NANC concurred with Chairman Hasselwander's suggestion.

I. NANPA Oversight WG Report. Co-Chair, Andrea Cooper, AirTouch, provided the report to the Council. Ms. Cooper reviewed the NANPA performance evaluation work plan timeline. Ms. Cooper reported that the performance matrix had been completed on February 4, 1999, and that it had been provided to the NANPA for the NANPA's completion of its self-evaluation. Ms. Cooper stated that Ron Conners, Lockheed Martin/NANPA, had been involved in the matrix development process.

More generally, Ms. Cooper reported that the NANPA evaluation will be conducted from March 8 to April 8, 1999. The evaluation will consist of several activities, including completion of the matrix, on-site visits to the Concord, California and Washington, D.C. Central Office Code Administration offices. The CO Code Transition Task Force also will provide input about

transition-related issues throughout the past year. Ms. Cooper also reported that the survey form, requesting public input on the NANPA's performance, including input from industry, the states and other interested members of the public, will be completed for the NANC's review and distribution by March 1, 1999. Ms. Cooper reported that the FCC had agreed to issue a press release concerning the survey, in an effort to increase the awareness of the survey and its purpose. Finally, Ms. Cooper indicated that the overall evaluation of the NANPA's performance will be drafted and provided to the NANC members by April 14, 1999, for final review at the NANC meeting on April 21, 1999.

Ms. Cooper commented that the on-site observations at the Concord office on February 24 will provide the NANPA Oversight Working Group evaluation team an opportunity to see the NANPA systems in place, inspect the secure areas and ensure that the processes set forth in section 9 of the Requirements Document are actually being performed.

Following discussion, the NANC accepted the work plan and associated timeline prepared by the NANPA Oversight Working Group. Vince Majkowski, NARUC, indicated that NARUC would distribute the performance feedback survey to its members, as well as to provide the survey to NASUCA representatives, as quickly as possible. In response to a question about the confidentiality of performance evaluation responses, Robert McDowell, Comptel, and Cathy Handley, PCIA, indicated that trade associations might be able to help on that issue, by submitting input on behalf of the association, rather than on behalf of any particular company. Ms. Cooper indicated that Linda Hymans, Texas PUC, will consolidate the survey responses.

In terms of the NANPA Oversight Working Group's future work, Ms. Cooper reported that the next meeting is scheduled for March 8, in Atlanta, for review of the completed compliance matrix. Thereafter, on March 30-31, the Working Group will meet in Dallas, to review the input from industry participants (survey results) and continue the review of the completed NANPA compliance matrix. In conclusion, Ms. Cooper stated that the final report will be drafted during the Working Group meeting scheduled for April 6-9 in Denver.

J. NANC CIS Petition Recommendation. Chairman Hasselwander reported that the FCC had that day released a Public Notice, seeking comments by March 17, 1999, on the Lockheed Martin petition to divest the CIS business unit, taking into account the responses submitted by Lockheed Martin and Mitretek Systems to the questions directed to them. Peter Guggina, MCI WorldCom, and the other members of the CIS Issue Management Group, agreed to review the responses of Lockheed Martin and Mitretek and to develop a draft recommendation for the full NANC's consideration by March 9. The NANC will review the draft recommendation and develop a final recommendation to be forwarded to the FCC by March 17, 1999.

Mr. Guggina agreed to organize the first conference call of the Issue Management Group.

February 18, 1999

Opening Remarks. Chairman Hasselwander discussed the ex parte filing that had been made by Lockheed Martin on February 4, 1999, on number optimization approaches and his ex parte meetings with FCC Commissioners on number exhaust issues. Chairman Hasselwander discussed the facts leading up to the study performed by Lockheed Martin on Number Utilization Forecast

and Trends and, in response, to NANC member questions, confirmed that the study to be presented to the NANC that day was not substantively different from that presented to the FCC in the Lockheed Martin *ex parte*. Chairman Hasselwander then turned the meeting over to Lockheed Martin for its presentation.

K. Lockheed Martin Presentation Relative to Number Utilization and Trends. Mark Foster, Lockheed Martin, provided background to the development of the initial report and explained the data models. Mr. Foster noted that the study is preliminary and had been released only because of the nature of the initial results. Mr. Foster indicated that the study is not intended to be definitive. Mr. Foster noted that forecasting the availability of NANP numbering resources is part of the general responsibilities of the NANPA, under the FCC's rules. He also noted that the 1999 COCUS results are expected by mid-1999 and that Lockheed Martin expects those results to predict area code exhaust within the next 10 years. Mr. Foster then provided an indepth review and explanation of Lockheed Martin's study and its results, as presented on the Lockheed Martin handout.

Mr. Foster's presentation provoked considerable discussion on the assumptions and results of the study. Chairman Hasselwander proposed, as a process going forward, that the NANC continue to study and to analyze number exhaust. Chairman Hasselwander recommended that analysis of pooling and other conservation measures be included within the scope of that work. He suggested that the NANC put together a group of 10-15 individuals who, working with Lockheed Martin, could test Lockheed Martin's study, its assumptions and results. Chairman Hasselwander suggested that participants should be knowledgeable with respect to Excel spread sheets, statistical methodology, and overall industry and numbering issues. They also should be able to dedicate a significant amount of time to the endeavor and participation should reflect a cross-representation of the industry. Chairman Hasselwander also suggested that the FCC and Canadian representatives should participate, to the extent possible.

Chairman Hasselwander suggested that the outcome of the effort should be a reasonable range of predicted NANP exhaust, using the Lockheed Martin study as a platform. The Lockheed Martin study should serve as a model against which to measure other conservation methods. Paul Hart, USTA, stated that the result of the NANC's efforts should be to develop a basic model by which industry can agree to continuously assess the assumptions on NANP exhaust. He also indicated that he believes the NANC must use this development as a means by which to finally resolve the issues surrounding the collection of forecast and utilization data.

Ron Binz, CPI, stated that it should be clear at the outset that the product of the study is a NANPA/Lockheed Martin product and not a NANC product; NANC's role should be to assist the NANPA in improving the product. Mr. Binz also expressed the view that the goal should not be to reach a consensus on NANP exhaust, but rather to conduct a study that will project the date of NANP exhaust with as much accuracy as possible.

Several NANC representatives volunteered to provide participants from within their organizations to assist in studying the current model and in developing an exhaust projection with which the industry is comfortable. Leo Mevel, CRTC, stated that this issue is crucial to Canada, and suggested that the costs of NANP expansion should be compared very carefully to the costs of number resource optimization. Peter Guggina, MCI WorldCom, added that the industry could

currently implement many strategies to add years to the life of the existing NANP before considering expansion of the NANP, which has been projected to cost anywhere from 50-150 billion dollars.

Chairman Hasselwander stated that as a first step the volunteers from USTA, PCIA, CTIA, NCTA, NARUC, MCI WorldCom, AT&T, Bell Atlantic, and SBC, should scrub and test the Lockheed Martin exhaust assumptions and conclusions. This group should report back to the NANC at NANC's April meeting. Chairman Hasselwander suggested that the group should test the effect of number resource optimization or conservations methods -- thousands block pooling, individual telephone number pooling and rate center consolidation -- on the estimates of NANP exhaust. Chairman Hasselwander suggested that volunteers provide Lockheed Martin with the name of the individual from within their organization who will participate in the activity and coordinate with Lockheed Martin to establish a first meeting date. Bill Adair, SBC, added that the model has the potential to test the use of the NPA resource with respect to overlays and should be used to conduct a total examination of the entire NPA resource.

Chairman Hasselwander restated that the group first should endeavor to understand the predicted exhaust date and, thereafter, to use the revised model to understand the potential effect of thousands block number pooling on number exhaust. The NANC agreed.

In closing, Frank Ferrante, Mitretek Systems, offered to assist in the review of the Lockheed Martin study. Blaise Scinto, Deputy Chief, Network Services Division, stated that the FCC also would participate in the group's efforts.

L. Steering Group Report. Chairman Hasselwander provided the report to the Council on the previous evening's Steering Group meeting. Chairman Hasselwander reported that the Steering Group had developed an interim audits process and recommendation. For the benefit of the NANC members, Karen Mulberry, MCI WorldCom, reviewed the handout entitled "Interim Audits Recommendation," including the objective, purpose, scope and audit process. Ms. Mulberry provided an overview of the proposed interim audit process. Following discussion, the NANC agreed to the interim audits recommendation, and concluded that the NANPA should begin the audit process immediately. Bell Atlantic volunteered to be the first "auditee."

Chairman Hasselwander reported that Ron Conners, Lockheed Martin, had provided the Steering Group with a report on its examination of various databases and the overall usefulness of the available data to serve as carrier contact information for COCUS and other purposes. Chairman Hasselwander reported that Lockheed Martin had concluded that because of uncertainty about the reliability of the data, Lockheed Martin had determined to rely on scrubbing its own database for carrier-specific contact information.

Chairman Hasselwander reported that a review of the Lockheed Martin Response to the Thousands Block Administration Requirements Document had started late in the evening. He also reported that all participants on the Steering Group Ad Hoc Review Team will need to sign non-disclosure agreements. Chairman Hasselwander noted that the group should be limited to 12-15 individuals and should include representatives from the Cost Recovery and NANPA Oversight Working Groups. Finally, Chairman Hasselwander reported that a meeting will be held in Washington, D.C., with the Steering Group Ad Hoc Review Team and Lockheed Martin

representatives present, to review the Lockheed Martin proposal.

Finally, Chairman Hasselwander reported that SBC volunteered to provide refreshments at the next Steering Group meeting, scheduled for the evening of March 16, 1999.

M. Other Business. Ron Havens, Sprint, reported that he has received a copy of the Australian consumer survey study. The study is copyright protected, however. Mr. Havens indicated that he would contact the proper Australian officials to receive approval to duplicate the study; once approval is received, he will make the study available to NANC members for their review and use.

V. NANC Action Items and Decisions Reached.

1. Local Number Portability Administration Working Group (LNPA WG). The LNPA WG will answer the question “. . . if thousand block pooling was ordered by the Commission, when is the earliest date that CMRS carriers could participate?” The answer will be provided at the March NANC meeting.

Through a public notification, the NANC will seek to supplement participation in the existing WNP SC. The LNPA WG will produce, and bring to the NANC, a work plan that distinguishes the work of the LNPA WG from that of the WNP SC. The LNPA WG is expected to continue to address the integration matters and the WNP SC will address “wireless only” matters; in the future, each group will make separate reports to the NANC. Groups are encouraged to continue to communicate with each other going forward.

The LNPA WG will revisit the recommendation presented for a Y2K quiet period. NANC is interested to see if a shorter time frame could be capable of accomplishing the concern of Y2K relating to NPAC/SMS software changes.

2. California Court Reporter Issue. Parties who wish to make a short position statement regarding the court reporter issue should send them to Chairman Hasselwander by March 9, 1999. NANC will close this issue at its meeting on March 16, at 1:30 p.m.

3. Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report. On the issue of 500/900 number portability, at the March NANC meeting, INC will report its progress relative to 500 number portability.

4. NANPA Oversight Working Group Report. NANC approved the NANPA Oversight Working Group's NANPA performance evaluation work plan. The FCC will issue a press release on or before March 1, 1999. Industry associations, USTA, PCIA ALTS, CompTel, and OPASTCO, as well as NARUC, will assist with distribution of the performance feedback survey. A draft press release, with survey questions, will be distributed to NANC members on or before February 25, 1999.

5. CIS Petition Issue Management Group (IMG). In response to a request from the Chief, Common Carrier Bureau, in the Common Carrier Bureau's February 17, 1999 Public Notice, NANC will provide a recommendation to the FCC by March 17, 1999, regarding the Lockheed

Martin CIS divestiture petition. The CIS IMG will provide a draft recommendation to NANC by March 9, for final approval at the March 17 meeting.

6. Lockheed Martin Number Utilization Forecast and Trends Presentation. NANC agreed to form an ad hoc group consisting of 12-15 representatives to work with Lockheed Martin on the NANP exhaust as presented, in an effort to reach a level of comfort on the exhaust projection within the boundary of the Lockheed Martin report. This effort will include the effect of thousand block pooling on number exhaust. The results will be reported at the April NANC meeting. Chairman Hasselwander will coordinate the first meeting date with Lockheed Martin and the ad hoc group. Industry volunteers are to forward the name of their representative to Chairman Hasselwander as soon as possible.

7. Steering Group Report. NANC approved the Steering Group's interim audits recommendation. The NANPA will commence audits as soon as possible. The recommendation will be modified to add clarity as to what entity has responsibility for providing the documentation identified in the bullet items of the section titled "Audit Process." The next Steering Group meeting will be held on March 16, in the Commission Meeting Room, at the FCC's Portals location. SBC has volunteered to provide refreshments for the evening meeting.

8. Ad Hoc Thousands Block Administration Group. An ad hoc group was formed to begin a first level review of the Lockheed Martin response to the Thousands Block Administration Requirements Document. Non-disclosure agreements were provided to those representatives participating in the evaluation effort. Peter Guggina will serve as coordinator for first meeting.